

REMARKS

The present Amendment cancels claims 1-11 and adds new claims 12-14. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 12-14.

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as the invention. As indicated above, claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 were canceled. Therefore, this rejection is rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Smith (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,391). As indicated above, claims 1-11 were canceled. Therefore, this rejection is rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

It should be noted that the cancellation of claims 1-11 was not intended nor should it be considered as an agreement on Applicants' part that the features recited in claims 1-11 are taught or suggested by Smith whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. The cancellation of claims 1-11 was simply intended to expedite prosecution of the present application.

The present Amendment adds new claims 12-14. New claims 12-14 are directed to a program control system, a method of controlling a program control system and a program executable by a program control system. According to the present invention, the program control system operates a workflow server program and an application in relation to each other. The workflow server program according to the present invention, obtains an operation status of the application program,

wherein the operation status of the application program includes information regarding a work ready status, a work performing status and a work completed status. According to the present invention, the application program transmits management information to the workflow server program in response to the operation status and the application program transmits a work ID and a subject ID of a work and a subject to be processed by the application program and information of the operation status to the workflow server program upon occurrence of the timing of each of a plurality of events.

Further, according to the present invention, upon reception of management information, the workflow server program updates, for each work ID, an application program in association with the work ID and management information including an ID of the subject to be processed by the application program associated with the work ID, information of the operation status, a work start time and a work completed time.

Still further, according to the present invention, when a working period calculated from the work start time and the work completed time exceeds a predetermined period, the workflow server program indicates a work ID, subject ID and a processing time of the application program for judgment as to whether a failure has occurred in the application program.

The above described features of the present invention are illustrated, for example, in Fig. 12 and described on page 23, line 21 through page 25, line 5 and on page 26, line 13 through page 27, line 4.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record particularly Smith whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

Smith teaches a method for performing external procedure calls from a server program to a client program while both are running in a heterogeneous computer. Particularly, Smith describes that a communication parameter and a result of processing between a server program and a client program are converted so as to enable exchange between different operating systems. The Examiner's attention is directed to col. 2, lines 60-67, col. 4, line 64 through col. 5, line 9 and col. 13, line 40 through col. 14, line 9.

The present invention differs substantially from that taught by Smith. The present invention is not directed to conducting processing between programs such as server and client programs as that taught by Smith. The present invention instead is directed to a system for permitting cooperation between a workflow program and an application program which provides for completing of various work corresponding to the status of various workflows. Such features are clearly not taught or suggested by Smith.

Further, according to the present invention, in order to monitor a processing of a subject which was transmitted as a request to the workflow server program, the workflow server program monitors for each work ID an application program in association with the work ID and management information including an ID of the subject to process by the application program associated with the work ID,

information of operation status, a work start time and a work completed time. Such features are clearly not taught or suggested by Smith.

Even further, according to the present invention, when a working period calculated from the work start time and the work completed time exceeds a predetermined period, the workflow server program according to the present invention indicates a work ID, a subject ID and a processing time of the application program so as to determine whether failure of the application program has occurred. Such features are clearly not taught or suggested by Smith.

Thus, Smith fails to teach or suggest a program control system, method of controlling a program or a program for operating a workflow server program and an application program in relation to teach other, wherein the workflow server program obtains an operation status of the application program wherein the operation status is work ready status, a work performing status, a work completing status as recited in the claims.

Further, Smith fails to teach or suggest that the application program transmits information to the workflow server program in response to the operation status and transmits a work ID and a subject ID of a work and subject to be processed by the application program and information operation status to the workflow server program upon timing of an occurrence of each of a plurality of events as recited in the claims.

Still further, Smith fails to teach or suggest that upon reception of the management information, the workflow server program updates, for each work ID, an application program stored in association with the work ID and management information including an ID of a subject to be processed by the application program

associated with the work ID, information of the operation status, a work start time and a work completed time as recited in the claims.

Even further still, Smith fails to teach or suggest that when a working period calculated from the work start time and the work completed time exceeds a predetermined time, the workflow server program indicates work ID, a subject ID and a processing time of the application program for judgment to determine whether a failure has occurred in the application program as recited in the claims.

Therefore, as is quite from the above, the features of the present invention as recited in new claims 12-14 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the above described rejection is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the reference utilized in the rejection of claims 1-11.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 12-14 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 12-14 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (500.39920X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120